

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

	15-1126 (25) OC
United States of America,) Case No. CR 15-438 CRBPS (MA)
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT)
Uscar Codo Defendant.)))
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on $\frac{201.21}{29.000}$, 2015, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from $\frac{201.21}{29.0000}$, 2015 to $\frac{201.21}{29.0000}$, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance would See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the proof or law, that it is unreasonable to expense.	due to [check applicable reasons] the number of rosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial and by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
_	deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, the diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given itments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance would necessary for effective preparation, ta See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time king into account the exercise of due dilignor. LED
	SEP 2 1 2015
IT IS SO ORDERED.	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DATED: 9/211 ((~	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney